

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**Drawing Objection**

The drawing was objected to for various informalities. The applicant agrees and amended Figure 12 accordingly. Furthermore, the specification was amended with respect to the element "200" as pointed out by the Examiner. Still further claims 9, 13, and 14 were amended to overcome the Examiner's drawing objection.

Specification Objection

The specification was objected to for various informalities. The applicant agrees and amended the application accordingly. No new matter was added by virtue of the amendments made herein.

Claim Objection

Claims 1, 2, 9, and 14 were objected to for various informalities. The applicant agrees and amended the application accordingly. Furthermore, claim 2 was canceled, and the objection should therefore be moot.

35 USC § 112

Claims 9-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for lack of antecedent basis. The applicant agrees and amended the claims accordingly.

35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, and 4 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wampfler. The applicant disagrees. Similarly, claim 1, 6, and 8. Again, the applicant disagrees. However, as claim 1 was amended to conform with allowable claim 3, the rejection is moot.

Similarly, claims 9-10 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jeon. The applicant disagrees. Nevertheless, claim 9 was amended to even more clearly distinguish over Jeon.

35 USC § 103

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Jeon in view of Duffy. The applicant disagrees. However, as claim 1 was amended to conform with allowable claim 3, dependent claim 7 should also be allowable and the rejection is therefore moot.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Kent in view of Wampfler. Claim 11 was canceled and the rejection is therefore moot.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Jeon in view of Duffy. The applicant disagrees as not all elements present in claim 13 are taught by the cited references. Therefore, claim 13 should not be rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Jeon in view of Duffy.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 5, 12, and 14 were deemed allowable if rewritten and amended to overcome the Office's concerns. The applicant agrees.

In view of the present amendments and arguments, the applicant believes that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

RUTAN & TUCKER
By 
Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46,697
Tel.: (714) 641-5100